

**Minutes from a Meeting of the Concordia Council on Student Life Held on Friday, 22 April 1994, 12:30 p.m., Loyola Campus, Room AD-131.**

**Present:** Dr. D.L. Boisvert, Chair; Mr. B.T. Counihan, Mr. H. Zarins, Ms. A. Kerby, Ms. N. Torbit, Mr. R. Côté, Mr. V. Pavlicik, Ms. C. Fortier, Ms. L. Grimes, Mr. P. Dalton, Ms. J. Brown, Mr. D. Leibu, Mr. K. Lowther, Dr. I.M. Barlow, Ms. J. Chegrinec, secretary.

**Absent:** Dr. S.M. Graub, Dr. B. Litner, Mr. A. Ghaemi, Ms. J. Davies, Ms. K. Bolh, Mr. A. Switzer.

**Guests:** Prof. T. Waugh, Ms. P. Rae, Rev. M. Terho, Ms. E. Paradis, J. Boyd, T. Patkau.

1. Approval of Agenda: The Chair requested the following change to the agenda; item 8a) **Final Report from the Task Force on Lesbian and Gay Life** - to be moved forward to follow item 4. On a motion by Ms. Torbit, seconded by Mr. Zarins, the agenda, as amended, was approved.
2. Remarks from the Chair: Mr. Counihan was congratulated on the successful CCSL Awards evening that was held 11 April, and congratulations were extended to those members of Council who received awards: Ms. Grimes, Mr. Leibu, Dr. Litner, and Mr. Lowther.
3. Approval of Minutes from the meeting of 18 March 1994: A modification was requested on item #7, page 6 "... the issue of the sexual assault report..." should read "... the issue of the safety audit report...". On a motion by Mr. Côté, seconded by Mr. Pavlicik, the minutes, as amended, were approved.
4. Business Arising from the Minutes: None.
5. New Business: a) **Final Report from the Task Force on Lesbian and Gay Life** - Dr. Boisvert opened the discussion by advising Council members that an action strategy for CCSL had been included with the documents for the meeting. He then proceeded to congratulate the Task Force on a thoughtful and thought provoking report. He introduced the Chair, Ms. Kerby, and those members who were present at that time: Ms. P. Rae, Dr. T. Waugh, Ms. E. Paradis and Rev. M. Terho.

A motion was made by Mr. Counihan, and seconded by Ms. Fortier, that the document Final Report from the Task Force on Lesbian and Gay Life, be received by the Concordia Council on Student Life.

Ms. Kerby, along with members of the task force, proceeded to discuss the processes utilized in arriving at conclusions and responded to questions from members. Those taking part in the discussion included: Ms. Kerby, Ms.

Fortier, Ms. Grimes, Dr. Boisvert, Mr. Pavlicik, Mr. Counihan, Ms. Torbit, Mr. Dalton, Mr. Côté, Mr. Leib, Mr. Lowther and, the various task force members present.

Ms. Kerby explained that the task force was formed at the request of Council, not to respond to "any horrendous incidents" - but as a desire to ensure the opportunity for the community to express their opinions. On the whole, the process was well received by the community. Members were frank in their admission that they originally had entered the process with a degree of anger and frustration, but over the period of time that anger became diffused to produce a more moderate document. The task force realized that Concordia provided an environment that was more tolerant than most for gays and lesbians.

It was agreed though that work at educating the faculty in terms of curricular matters still had to be done, and although this was not a specified area in the mandate of the task force, it was felt that the education of the faculty had to be included in the report. Ms. Kerby verified that the report had been forwarded to the faculties, and agreed with the suggestion of training session being established for faculty members.

Ms. Grimes requested that a follow-up letter be sent to the editor of The Mirror, which had "leaked" the report prior to the meeting, stating that although the article contained some positive statements about the University's leadership in the role of gay and lesbian rights, it came across much more negative than necessary. Ms. Kerby agreed to contact the editor. Ms. Grimes also pointed out what she perceived as an oversight in the report, the Concordia Student Union does have a detailed section in their collective agreement on discrimination.

It was also asked why the task force did not specifically interview student government or the student media. The response was that open announcements had been made and that the editors of the student newspapers had been invited to address the committee.

In response to Mr. Pavlicik's request for a summary of the survey results, it was explained that the survey was not done professionally, and as this was the case the task force did not feel that a summary should be included.

Ms. Torbit inquired about the process that the task force went through to reach conclusions as well as to have the task force members outline what they think CCSL and individuals could do to implement the report.

It was urged that a follow-up be done with the academic sector. The task force found consensus within the Student Life sector of the University, but it was



agreed that the faculties would prove to be difficult to reach, especially in a time of programme cutbacks and financial constraints. It would be difficult at this time to introduce reforms which are seen by the majority of the community as "frills". It was suggested that a strong recommendation be made to the academic sector that it initiate its own process in dealing curriculum questions.

As regards the process, it was agreed by task force members that the moderate tone was reached only after a lot of hard work. Although the report may, on first reading, appear moderate, if the recommendations contained within are acted upon, it will result in major changes.

Mr. Dalton requested that his remarks be recorded for the record. Although in agreement and supportive of the report as a whole, he found the statements on page 26, section 1, 2nd paragraph, regarding student government, offensive. The response from task force members was: student government refused to meet with the task force; the comments did not specifically refer to any one government, since the report took a period of time to write, more than one student government has been in office since the inception of the task force. Mr. Dalton emphasized that the comments contained in the section create a perception that could be directed towards the current government, and himself in particular.

As a follow-up to Mr. Côté's question to the task force on what can his department do to ensure the implementation of not only the recommendations but the sensitization of individuals, Dr. Boisvert informed CCSL that he has requested that the Student Services' Directors respond in writing on how their areas intend to implement the recommendations that directly concern them.

Mr. Leibu, as president-elect of the Engineering and Computer Science Student Association, asked task force members on what support he, and his executive, could expect to be given in sensitizing his particular constituency to issues of discrimination against gays and lesbians. The task force responded that by student governments coming out against such discrimination it provides support that is presently missing. They would be willing to help all groups educate their areas, and would be available for follow-up and support.

Action Strategy: It was moved by Ms. Kerby and seconded by Ms. Torbit that the action strategy be adopted. Ms. Grimes asked that in recommendation #1, the word "central" be changed to "essential". Dr. Boisvert informed CCSL that costs associated with the report have been absorbed by the budget of the Associate Vice-Rector, Services. A 3-page summary has been prepared of the report and 600 copies sent throughout the community. All summaries and reports mailed have been accompanied by a letter requesting comments and

suggestions. Follow-up will be done on any feedback received.

A vote on the adoption of the action strategy was taken, with 9 yeas, 1 opposed and 1 abstention. The motion to accept the action strategy was carried and the discussion closed.

6. Student Life Issues: Since Dr. Barlow would have to leave the meeting early, this item was advanced on the agenda. Ms. Grimes, Mr. Lowther, and Ms. Brown tabled issues for Dr. Barlow's consideration and response.

- The escalators in the Hall Building continue to be a major irritant with constant stoppages. Dr. Barlow could only reiterate that the major cause of stoppage is individuals stopping the escalators so they can walk down them instead of using the stairs.
- There was general dissatisfaction over the shuttle bus schedule during the examination period, and questions on why the buses stop at 5:00 p.m. Dr. Barlow explained that the schedule is based on the original mandate of the shuttle buses which was never intended to replace public transportation. The shuttle buses are to provide transport between classes. It was pointed out that the schedule does nothing to alleviate an already exam induced stressful situation. Dr. Barlow maintained though that the demand is not great enough during this period to justify the costs associated with running a fuller schedule during exams or the summer period.

In regards to the exam bus schedule being implemented, Mr. Lowther and Ms. Brown suggested that a more effective way of disseminating information to students be found. Perhaps full-page ads in the student newspapers, or large, clear signs at the bus stops.

- Ms. Grimes raised the issue of storage space being used presently to store escalator equipment. The space is on the 4th floor, and used to be used for storage by Cencon.
- Dr. Barlow indicated to Ms. Grimes that he would examine more fully her request to replace the art work that is presently displayed in the Hall Building going from the Mezzanine to the 4th floor.

7. Reports from Directors: Health Services - Ms. Torbit reported on the increased demands made on Health Services during the exam period, especially in the area of medical notes. She informed Council of an increase in TB incidences. Regarding the Summer Leadership Conference, Ms. Torbit will discuss this issue with CUSA to see if anyone wants to attend.

In response to Ms. Brown's query on how the University intends to proceed



since receiving a no vote to the Recreation and Athletics facilities referendum, Dr. Boisvert informed Council that senior administration will be meeting shortly to discuss the issue. He also informed CCSL that a negative vote "does not mean never - just not now".

**Dean of Students -** Mr. Counihan reported on the CCSL awards night and encouraged everyone to nominate individuals for the Graduation Awards. Mr. Counihan also informed Council that the plan of action for the self-appraisal and evaluation of Student Services had begun. The Directors would be submitting their self-appraisal documents in September.

**Financial Aid & Awards -** Mr. Côté reported that the Ministry has acknowledged that there exists a problem in the debt load carried by students. In regards to the Research dossier shared with Dr. Graub, he reported that the target had been met on the survey with the six other universities, and the analysis will be carried out during May.

**Advocacy & Support Services -** Ms. Kerby reported that the major focus now is support for students writing exams. As a matter of information, three students from Rawanda have been identified and are presently being supported through the International Student Office.

8. Report from the Planning and Resources Committee: Ms. Torbit, Co-chair advised that a wrap-up will be tabled at the next meeting of Council.
9. **b) Other New Business -** Mr. Lowther stated for the record his distress and disappointment with the handling of the Recreation & Athletics facilities upgrade process. It is Mr. Lowther's contention that, if CCSL is responsible for student life, the proposal should have been brought forward to CCSL for discussion and approval prior to going to a referendum.
10. Next Meeting: The next meeting of CCSL will be held Friday, 20 May 1994, SGW, H-771.
11. Termination of Meeting: On a motion by Mr. Côté, seconded by Mr. Zarins, the meeting terminated at 2:45 p.m.